

Reply-To: bu.edu!INFO-HAMS@WSMR-SIMTEL20.ARMY.MIL
Subject: INFO-HAMS Digest V89 #955
To: INFO-HAMS@WSMR-SIMTEL20.ARMY.MIL

INFO-HAMS Digest Thu, 30 Nov 89 Volume 89 : Issue 955

Today's Topics:

 Direct Digital Synthesis
 My backyard, your backyard ... (4 msgs)
 Nintendo on airplanes!?!?!?!?

Date: 29 Nov 89 23:17:56 GMT
From: cs.utexas.edu!hellgate.utah.edu!uplherc!esunix!hcooper@tut.cis.ohio-
state.edu (Harrison Cooper)
Subject: Direct Digital Synthesis
Message-ID: <1685@esunix.UUCP>

For info on DDS, look at the Nov. 9 issue of EDN. They have an article describing it (haven't read it yet). I also have a couple of copies of articles from another engineer here at work which describes it as well - if interested, I'll post those sources as well (if I can find it).

H Cooper
N7KST

Date: 30 Nov 89 22:39:11 GMT
From: tank!cps3xx!usenet@handies.ucar.edu (Usenet file owner)
Subject: My backyard, your backyard ...
Message-ID: <5610@cps3xx.UUCP>

In article <6589@lynx.UUCP> neal@lynx.UUCP (Neal Woodall) writes:
>In article <2942@cpoint.UUCP> die@cpoint.UUCP (David I. Emery) writes:
>My point was that it is illegal to receive the services without *paying*
>for them. The point I was trying to make is that you have a right to
>receive anything, but that a victimization occurs if you receive a service
>that is intended as a revenue-generating product or service and you do not
>pay the fair market value for the service.
>
>Again, IMHO, the only caveat in pay-for-reception is that you should pay for
>services that are intended as programming for revenue generation. The
>providers MAY NOT DENY YOUR RIGHT TO RECEIVE, but your right to receive does
>NOT guarantee that you can receive everything for FREE!
>

Neal:

This is an interesting idea, but it won't work in practice. There are a couple of possible scenerios that could occur under this paradigm. The payment could be extracted from the "users" of the service; this would require a police state. I am not willing to accept this scenerio. The other option is that the company could expect people to be on their honour to pay. This idea has been around for a long time, and apparently it works; consider public tv and shareware software. Unfortunately, our government is heading in the direction of the police state.

Solutions: Since we have recognized that the police state doesn't work (E. Germany, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Hungary, Soviet Union, and it's only a matter of time until we shall hear rumblings from mainland China again), we should not legislate "protection" for companies providing services via RF. Companies should either provide their services only by wire, provide a service which is paid for by commercials, or adopt the shareware/public tv paradigm.

In the rare case that original ideas	Kenneth J. Hendrickson	N8DGN
are found here, I am responsible.	Owen W328, E. Lansing, MI 48825	
Internet: kjh@pollux.usc.edu	UUCP: ...!uunet!pollux!kjh	

Date: 30 Nov 89 23:18:47 GMT
From: cs.utexas.edu!ut-emx!trey@tut.cis.ohio-state.edu (Trey Garlough)
Subject: My backyard, your backyard ...
Message-ID: <21682@ut-emx.UUCP>

In article <6589@lynx.UUCP>, neal@lynx.uucp (Neal Woodall) writes:

> HOWEVER, you do have the right to receive anything that is broadcast over
> the public's airwaves. You cannot be denied the right to receive any signal
> that your can get into your antenna!

We are in agreement here.

> Again, IMHO, the only caveat in pay-for-reception is that you should pay for
> services that are intended as programming for revenue generation. The
> providers MAY NOT DENY YOUR RIGHT TO RECEIVE, but your right to receive does
> NOT guarantee that your can receive everything for FREE!

I strongly disagree here. The providers MAY deny your right to receive and the way they can go about this is by not beaming their signal to your house! This can be done by using directional antennas or by landlines. If you irradiate my house with rf, I consider it my prerogative to demodulate it.

I consider it absolutely incredible that these outfits like HBO are sending unsolicited movies to everyone, then getting inflamed because some of the people who receive these the movies (and basically everybody in North America receives them) aren't ponying up big bucks. What a scam! It would be like them (without my permission) sending me VHS cassettes in the mail and then asking me to send them money. After all, they have sent me something of value, something "intended as programming for revenue generation."

I have been getting free movies at home from HBO ever since I can remember and I have never paid them a dime. In fact, I have been getting free movies from them no matter where I go: my office, in my car, in my friend's boat out on the lake -- even when I took a holiday in the US Virgin Islands. I can't seem to get away from them. Well I have a message for HBO, et. al.: Stop sending me your damned movies! I don't want them!

Trey Garlough
Computation Center, University of Texas, Austin, Texas 78712
trey@emx.CC.UTEXAS.EDU (internet) (512-471-3241)

Date: 30 Nov 89 23:10:08 GMT
From: cs.utexas.edu!ut-emx!trey@tut.cis.ohio-state.edu (Trey Garlough)
Subject: My backyard, your backyard ...
Message-ID: <21681@ut-emx.UUCP>

In article <6589@lynx.UUCP>, neal@lynx.uucp (Neal Woodall) writes:

> HOWEVER, you do have the right to receive anything that is broadcast over
> the public's airwaves. You cannot be denied the right to receive any signal
> that your can get into your antenna!

We are in agreement here.

> Again, IMHO, the only caveat in pay-for-reception is that you should pay for
> services that are intended as programming for revenue generation. The
> providers MAY NOT DENY YOUR RIGHT TO RECEIVE, but your right to receive does
> NOT guarantee that your can receive everything for FREE!

I strongly disagree here. The providers MAY deny your right to receive and the way they can go about this is by not beaming their signal to your house! This can be done by using directional antennas or by landlines. If you irradiate my house with rf, I consider it my prerogative to demodulate it.

I consider it absolutely incredible that these outfits like HBO are sending

unsolicited movies to everyone, then getting inflamed because some of the people who receive these the movies (and basically everybody in North America receives them) are ponying up big bucks. What a scam! It would be like them (without my permission) sending me VHS cassettes in the mail and then asking me to send them money. After all, they have sent me something of value, something "intended as programming for revenue generation."

I have been getting free movies at home from HBO ever since I can remember and I have never paid them a dime. In fact, I have been getting free movies from them no matter where I go: my office, in my car, in my friend's boat out on the lake -- even when I took a holiday in the US Virgin Islands. I can't seem to get away from them. Well I have a message for HBO, et. al.: Stop sending me your damned movies! I don't want them!

Trey Garlough
Computation Center, University of Texas, Austin, Texas 78712
trey@emx.CC.UTEXAS.EDU (internet) (512-471-3241)

Date: 1 Dec 89 00:16:50 GMT
From: deimos.cis.ksu.edu!harris.cis.ksu.edu!mac@uunet.uu.net (Myron A. Calhoun)
Subject: My backyard, your backyard ...
Message-ID: <5040@deimos.cis.ksu.edu>

In article <6589@lynx.UUCP> neal@lynx.UUCP (Neal Woodall) writes:

[many lines deleted]

>Think of it like a performance given in a public place: The group giving the
>performance may have a specific target audience in mind, and they may have
>advertised for a certain group of people to buy a ticket, but they cannot
>legally exclude any member of the public who may wish to attend....but
>everyone who attends, regardless of whether or not they are the intended
>audience, must pay for the show.

Not true! Your analogy is faulty. Consider this: many plays ARE performed in our local city park, and admission IS often charged. To separate the paid from the unpaid, a rope "fence" is strung around the seating area.

But from the outside of the "fence" I can watch the play and hear the dialog without paying.

Of course, I'm farther from the stage than I would be if I were inside the fence, and I'm perhaps a bit less comfortable since I have to stand instead of sit, but I CAN (and DO occasionally) watch the plays!

--Myron.

--

Myron A. Calhoun, PhD EE, W0PBV, (913) 532-6350 (work), 539-4448 (home).
INTERNET: mac@ksuvax1.cis.ksu.edu
BITNET: mac@ksuvax1.bitnet
UUCP: ...{rutgers, texbell}!ksuvax1!harry!mac

Date: 30 Nov 89 21:35:35 GMT
From: usc!henry.jpl.nasa.gov!elroy.jpl.nasa.gov!jpl-devvax!jenkins@apple.com
(Steve Jenkins)
Subject: Nintendo on airplanes!?!?!?!
Message-ID: <6521@jpl-devvax.JPL.NASA.GOV>

In article <5593@cps3xx.UUCP> hendrick@frith.UUCP (Kenneth J. Hendrickson) writes:
>The Columbian gov't. apparently takes a real dim view of people shipping
>Nintendo games in their suitcases on airplanes. They took one such
>suitcase, and blew it up. They thought the Nintendo game was a bomb. I
>think this is good grounds for sueing the gov't.

And now for the facts: A suitcase to be loaded on an Avianca jetliner
at Los Angeles International Airport was suspected, after X-ray
examination, of containing an explosive device. The LAPD Bomb Squad
exploded the suitcase, in accordance with their standard procedures.
It was determined afterwards that the device causing the suspicious
image was a Nintendo game.

Less than a week ago, an Avianca jetliner exploded in flight, killing
all aboard. The possibility of sabotage has not been ruled out.

The owner of the suitcase will be reimbursed.

The name of the country is 'Colombia'.

>I am all in favour of
>increased security, but increased stupidity is another matter.

Agreed. What does this have to do with ham radio? Followups to /dev/null.

--
Steve Jenkins N6UNI jenkins@jpl-devvax.jpl.nasa.gov
Caltech/Jet Propulsion Laboratory (818) 354-0162

End of INFO-HAMS Digest V89 Issue #955
